



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,024	06/11/2001	Philip S. Coulthard	CA920010014US1/2182P	3395
7590 12/28/2005			EXAMINER	
Sawyer Law Group LLP			STORK, KYLE R	
P.O. Box 51418			ART UNIT	
Palo Alto, CA 94303			PAPER NUMBER	
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,024

Applicant(s)

COULTHARD ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the amendment submitted with the request for continued examination filed 26 October 2005.

2. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and –13 are independent claims. The rejections of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C 112, 35 U.S.C. 102, and 35 U.S.C. 103 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al. (US 2002/0120787, filed 28 February 2001, hereafter Shapiro) and further in view of Sarkar et al. (US 2004/0015839, filed 9 April 2001, hereafter Sarkar).

As per independent claim 1, Shapiro discloses a method for converting display source code of a legacy application having mixed business and presentation logic on a server to a network interactive web-browser page, the method comprising:

- Resolving the display source code of the legacy application into a plurality of record formats (paragraphs 0090-0091)
- For each of the plurality of record formats, resolving a plurality of references within the record format to database files (paragraphs 0090-0091; 0109; 0130-

0135: Here, XML files are stored in the database. These XML files reference functions and data of the legacy application)

- Determining a hierarchy relationship of the plurality of references within the database files (paragraph 0121)
- Parsing the plurality of references within the database file to a web-language file using tags to capture the hierarchy and relationship of the plurality of references within the database files (paragraphs 0121 and 0130-0135: Here, the files contain inheritance between data type definitions. Inheritance between types is a form of hierarchy)

Shapiro fails to specifically disclose converting one or more network user interface pages to an object-oriented platform-independent network language by including:

- Creating dynamic components for input, output, and feedback references of each record format, the dynamic components for populating the one or more network user interface pages
- Creating a static component for unchanging references of each record format, the static component representing the one or more network user interface pages

However, Sarkar discloses converting one or more network user interface pages to an object-oriented platform-independent network language by including:

- Creating dynamic components for input, output, and feedback references of each record format, the dynamic components for populating the one or more network user interface pages (paragraph 0011)

- Creating a static component for unchanging references of each record format, the static component representing the one or more network user interface pages (paragraphs 0010 and 0040: Here, static variables define static components of a JavaServer Page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 2, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein the network interactive web-browser page is displayed on the internet (paragraphs 0062).

As per dependent claim 3, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses the network interactive web-browser page is displayed on a network selected from the group consisting of: an internal network, an Intranet, a LAN, a WAN, an internal bus, a wireless network (paragraphs 0062-0063).

As per dependent claim 4, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses use of an XML language file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 5, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses use of an HTML file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 6, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to specifically disclose use of a WML file. However, WML was well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being an XML protocol for specifying markup for WAP devices. While Shapiro does not specifically disclose WML, Shapiro does disclose use of wireless connections (paragraph 0063) and XML (paragraph 0061). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined WML with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user of a WAP enabled device to obtain legacy data.

As per dependent claim 7, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein the static component further comprises a JavaServer Page (paragraph 0010). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 8, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein the dynamic components further comprise JavaBeans (paragraph 0010-0011).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 9, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein the one or more network user interface pages are stored on the server (paragraphs 0067-0071).

As per independent claims 10-13, the applicant recites the limitations that are substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 10-13 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 14, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses performing steps of the method at development time during which a user is preparing a new user interface for the legacy application (paragraph 0086: Here, the data mining system determines functions calls that can be made to a legacy application and stores them in a repository prior to a user issuing a function call).

As per dependent claim 16, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein parsing the display file data description source and converting the network user interface page are each executed during development time of the web-browser page and the dynamically updating the web-browser page and displaying the web-browser page are each executed during runtime (paragraphs 0010-0011). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro and Sarkar, and further in view of Guheen et al. (US 6721713, filed 27 May 1999, hereafter Guheen).

As per dependent claim 15, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to specifically disclose performing operations offline without a remote connection to the server upon which the application resides. However, Guheen discloses performing methods offline (column 210, lines 14-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Guheen with Shapiro and Sarkar, since it would have allowed a user to minimize data requests while pages were being generated.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krS



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER